

Serial No.: 09/921,465
Examiner: G. Koch
Art Unit: 1734
Date: January 19, 2004

REMARKS

In the Office action, claims 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as not meeting the written description requirement; claims 1, 3, 8 and 19 were rejected as anticipated by Jahn; claims 1, 2 and 4 were rejected as anticipated by Madden; claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 14 were rejected as anticipated by Friel; claims 2, 4, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Jahn and Corrigan; claims 4, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Friel and Corrigan; claim 5 was rejected as being unpatentable over Jahn or Friel and Hollstein; claim 18 was rejected as being unpatentable over Jahn or Friel and Levy; claim 18 was rejected as being unpatentable over Jahn or Friel and Patel; and claim 20 was rejected as being unpatentable over Jahn or Friel and Drummond.

As a preliminary matter, the title and abstract are amended to be more specific to the presently claimed subject matter.

The specification has been amended to incorporate a portion of the provisional patent application that was incorporated by reference in the present application. Specifically the provisional described the use of case studies as part of a remote network based ecommerce site. No new matter has been added, it being clearly described in the provisional application the nature and manner of use of such case studies. Claims 16 and 17 hereof are amended to conform with this disclosure.

As to the rejections on the merits, it is noted that the main references cited (Jahn, Friel and Madden) all relate to making available some selections of paint and or parameters, most notably in a vehicle assembly line. The applied references thus basically presume an existing material application system and are not directed to a remote configuration concept for the material application system. It is respectfully submitted that the art of record makes no suggestion of a system that allows remote configuration of the actual material application system as presently claimed. Although it is believed that the claims as originally filed were directed to the application system and not the applied material such as paint for example, the claims are amended to further clarify this aspect of the claimed invention. Claim 1, and new claim 23, recite that the system relates to configuring a material application system that uses different components such as a gun. The art of record is not directed to and cannot suggest such a system.

JAN. 19. 2004 2:27PM

CALFEE HALTER GRISWOLD

NO. 3765 P. 10

Serial No.: 09/921,465
Examiner: G. Koch
Art Unit: 1734
Date: January 19, 2004

The new claims are directed to additional aspects of the invention and do not add new matter. Applicants generally traverse the rejections of the dependent claims but detailed comment will be deferred pending further examination of the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 19, 2004

By: 

Leonard L. Lewis

Reg. No. 31,176

(216) 622-8683